



16 MAR 2006

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

Kia Silverbrook  
Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd.  
393 Darling Street  
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

In re Application of :  
Kia Silverbrook :  
Application No.: 10/693,978 :  
Filed: October 28, 2003 : DECISION ON PETITION  
Attorney Docket No.: ZG006US :  
For: METHOD OF FABRICATING AN :  
INKJET PRINthead CHIP FOR USE :  
WITH A PULSATING PRESSURE INK :  
SUPPLY :

This is a decision on the petition under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3), filed September 19, 2005, to accept an unintentionally delayed claim under 35 U.S.C. §120 for the benefit of priority to the prior-filed nonprovisional applications set forth in the amendment filed concurrently with the instant petition.

The petition is **DISMISSED**.

The present nonprovisional application was filed after November 29, 2000, and the claim herein for the benefit of priority to the prior-filed nonprovisional applications is submitted after expiration of the period specified in 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2)(ii). Therefore, this is a proper petition under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3).

A petition for acceptance of a claim for late priority under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3) is only applicable to those applications filed on or after November 29, 2000. Further, the petition is appropriate only after the expiration of the period specified in 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2)(ii). In addition, the petition under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3) must be accompanied by:

- (1) the reference required by 35 U.S.C. § 120 and 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2)(i) of the prior-filed application(s), unless previously submitted;
- (2) the surcharge set forth in § 1.17(t); and
- (3) a statement that the entire delay between the date the claim was due under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2)(ii) and the date the claim was filed was unintentional. The Commissioner may require additional information where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional.

The petition does not comply with item (1) above.

A reference to add the prior-filed applications on page one following the first sentence of the specification has been included in a concurrently filed amendment. However, the amendment is not acceptable as drafted since it improperly incorporates by reference the prior-filed applications Petitioner's attention is directed to Dart Industries v. Banner, 636 F.2d 684, 207 USPQ 273 (C.A.D.C. 1980), where the court drew a distinction between a permissible 35 U.S.C. § 120 statement and the impermissible introduction of new matter by way of incorporation by reference in a 35 U.S.C. § 120 statement. The court specifically stated:

Section 120 merely provides a mechanism whereby an application becomes entitled to benefit of the filing date of an earlier application disclosing the same subject matter. Common subject matter must be disclosed, in both applications, either specifically or by an express incorporation-by-reference of prior disclosed subject matter. Nothing in section 120 itself operates to carry forward any disclosure from an earlier application. In re deSeversky, supra at 674, 177 USPQ at 146-147. Section 120 contains no magical disclosure-augmenting powers able to pierce new matter barriers. It cannot, therefore, "limit" the absolute and express prohibition against new matter contained in section 251.

In order for the incorporation by reference statement to be effective as a proper safeguard against the omission of a portion of a prior application, the incorporation by reference statement must be included in the specification-as-filed, or in an amendment to the specification filed concurrently therewith. *See In re deSeversky, supra. Note also MPEP 201.06(c).*

Accordingly, before the petition under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3) can be granted, a substitute amendment<sup>1</sup> deleting the incorporation by reference statement, along with a renewed petition under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3), is required.

Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed as follows:

By mail:                    Mail Stop PETITIONS  
                                  Commissioner for Patents  
                                  Post Office Box 1450  
                                  Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

---

<sup>1</sup> *Note 37 CFR 1.121*

By hand: Customer Service Window  
Mail Stop Petitions  
Randolph Building  
401 Dulany Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314

By fax: (571) 273-8300  
ATTN: Office of Petitions

Any questions concerning this matter may be directed to Anthony Smith at (571) 272-3298.



Boris Milef  
Legal Examiner  
Office of Petitions and PCT Legal Administration